

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 11, 2003.

Submitted herewith is a petition under 37 CFR §1.136 and the required fee requesting a one month extension in which to file this Amendment. With the extension, this response is due on July 11, 2003.

No further extension of time is believed to be necessary for the filing of this Amendment, but if such an extension of time is required, applicants request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for such an extension to Deposit Account No. 11-1158.

Based on the foregoing amendments to the claims, there is pending in this application a total of 19 claims of which 2 are independent claims. Accordingly, applicants believe that no additional claim fees are required for this Amendment. However, if such fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 11-1158.

In reviewing the Office Action Summary (PTO Form 326) for this Office Action, it was noted that the box indicating acknowledgment of applicants' claim for domestic priority under 35 USC §119(e) was not checked. Applicants assume that their claim for priority to provisional application number 60/150,451, filed August 24, 1999, is of record in this application, but if not, such action is respectfully requested.

### II. The §102 and §103 Rejections

In the March 11<sup>th</sup> Office Action, the Examiner asserted that van de Ven, U.S. Patent No. 4,666,248, anticipates Claims 1, 6-7, and 11-14 and that Cooper, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 3,580,661, anticipates Claims 1 and 6-14.

In making these rejections, the Examiner stated that van de Ven's "screen is used with a conventional slide or film projector which will have an

exit pupil from which images will be projected." (3/11/03 Office Action at page 2.) Similarly, as to Cooper, Jr., the Examiner stated that "the typical projector 12' used with the screen must have an exit pupil to form the divergent beam 14 of images." (3/11/03 Office Action at page 3.)

Although not agreeing with the functions ascribed to the exit pupil by the Examiner, applicants do agree that a typical or conventional projector has an exit pupil. However, applicants' claims require more than the existence of an exit pupil -- they require a specific relationship between the holes of an opaque layer and the exit pupil, namely, that:

said holes [of the opaque layer are] at locations which correspond to the images of the exit pupil [of a projection lens] formed by the combination of the Fresnel structure and the lenslet array.

Nowhere in the van de Ven or Cooper Jr. patents is there any mention of the "exit pupil" of a projection lens. That being the case, there is clearly no disclosure that holes in an opaque layer should have locations which correspond to the images of such an exit pupil formed by a combination of a Fresnel structure and a lenslet array.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of this lack of disclosure, the Examiner has not establish anticipation. As succinctly summarized by Judge Learned Hand in Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. v. Mimex Co., 124 F.2d 986, 989, 52 USPQ 138, 142 (2d Cir. 1942):

No doctrine of the patent law is better established than that a prior patent or other publication to be an anticipation must bear within its four corners adequate directions for the practice of the patent invalidated. If the earlier disclosure offers no more than a starting point for further experiments, if its teaching will sometimes succeed and sometimes fail, if it does not inform the art without more how to practice the new invention, it has not correspondingly enriched the store of common knowledge, and it is not an anticipation.

Plainly, neither van de Van nor Cooper, Jr. can be fairly said to have enriched the art of projection screens in the area of selecting the locations for the holes of an opaque layer relative to the exit pupil of a projection lens. That being the case, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's §102 rejections based on these references should be withdrawn.

Likewise, applicants believe that their claims are not obvious in view of van de Van and/or Cooper, Jr. By having holes in an opaque layer of the type called for by Claim 1, applicants achieve a number of advantages not recognized by the art. In particular, these locations balance the competing criteria of maximizing throughput of image light to the viewer while minimizing the amount of room light (ambient light) which can enter the screen from the outside and reduce contrast.

Neither van de Ven nor Cooper, Jr. recognizes that one needs to take into account how a Fresnel structure and lenslet array combination images the exit pupil of a projection lens in order to achieve a maximizing of desired light (image light) and a minimizing of undesired light (ambient light). Accordingly, neither of these references nor their combination can properly be said to disclose or suggest applicants' invention.

The Examiner's third reference -- Guzman U.S. Patent No. 4,184,762 -- is even farther away from applicants' invention since it does not even show a Fresnel/lenslet/opaque layer combination.

There are other differences between the cited references and applicants' dependent claims, but in view of the fundamental distinctions discussed above, a consideration of those differences is not considered necessary at this point.

### III. Claims 13 and 15-20

By the above amendments, Claim 14 has been combined into Claim 13, and that claim has been written in independent form. Dependent

Claims 15-20, which correspond to original dependent Claims 2-7, have also been added to the application.

As amended, Claim 13 further specifies the relationship between a projection lens' exit pupil and a rear projection screen. Specifically, Claim 13 requires that the screen has a Fresnel structure whose front focal distance is equal to the distance between the projection lens' exit pupil and the screen.

As discussed above, there is no discussion of exit pupils in either van de Van or Cooper, Jr. That being the case, there is plainly no teaching of the spatial relationship between an exit pupil and a Fresnel structure called for by independent Claim 13 and thus by its dependent claims. Accordingly, for this reason also, applicants believe that Claims 13 and 15-20 are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and the issuance of a notice of allowance for this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/11/03 Maurice M. Klee  
Maurice M. Klee, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 30,399  
Attorney for Applicant  
1951 Burr Street  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-1400

Exhibit A  
Annotated Copy of Claim 13

13. (amended) A rear screen projection system comprising a projection lens having an exit pupil and [the screen of Claim 1.] a rear projection screen which has a light entering side and a light exiting side and comprises in order from said light entering side to said light exiting side:

(a) a Fresnel structure;

(b) a lenslet array; and

(c) an opaque layer comprising a plurality of holes, said holes being at locations which correspond to the images of the exit pupil formed by the combination of the Fresnel structure and the lenslet array;

wherein the Fresnel structure has a front focal distance and the distance from the exit pupil of the projection lens to the screen is equal to said front focal distance.